



**Pacific Electric (PE) ROW/West Santa Ana Branch Corridor  
Alternatives Analysis  
Steering Committee Meeting #5**

April 27, 2011

3:00 – 4:30 PM

City of Buena Park

Walter Ehlers Community Center – Heritage Hall

8150 Knott Avenue, Buena Park, CA

**Meeting Summary**

Attendees	Organization
Hon. Carolyn Cavecche	OCTA
Hon. Diane DuBois	Metro
Hon. Tony Lima	City of Artesia
Hon. Scott Larsen	City of Bellflower
Hon. Bruce Barrows	City of Cerritos
Hon. Todd Seymore	City of Cypress
Shannon DeLong	City of Downey
Hon. Ralph Rodriguez	City of La Palma
G. Daniel Ojeda	City of Lynwood
Hon. Ed Varela	City of Maywood
Hon. Michele Martinez	City of Santa Ana
Hon. Maria Davila	City of South Gate
Hon. Mark Waldman	Orange County Council of Governments
Matthew Harper	Orange County Supervisorial District 1
Hasan Ikhata	SCAG
Philip Law	SCAG
Rich Macias	SCAG
Naresh Amatya	SCAG
Matt Gleason	SCAG
Steve Fox	SCAG
Alan Patashnick	Metro
Tami Warren	OCTA
Kurt Brotke	OCTA
Marissa Espino	OCTA
Andrea West	OCTA
Mike Kodama	OLDA
David Sanchez	City of Anaheim
Greg Garcia	City of Anaheim

Keith Jones	City of Garden Grove
David Biondolillo	City of Santa Ana
Raul Godinez	City of Santa Ana
Alvie Betancourt	City of South Gate
Kevin Wilson	City of Vernon
Nancy Michali	AECOM
Joel Ulloa	AECOM
Yara Jasso	AECOM
Katherine Padilla	Katherine Padilla & Associates

## 1. Welcome and Introductions

Co-chairs MTA Director/Mayor Diane DuBois and OCTA Director/Mayor Carolyn Cavecche opened the meeting and welcomed committee members. Meeting attendees then introduced themselves. The co-chairs reviewed with committee members the Alternatives Analysis (AA) Study's Purpose, which is to identify a locally preferred strategy for reuse of the corridor, and the role of the Steering Committee.

P. Law then stated the meeting's objectives:

- 1) To review the Study's Evaluation Criteria and, based on the Criteria, the Initial Screening Results;
- 2) To identify the Final Set of Alternatives to be studied during the final phase of the Alternatives Analysis.

## 2. Response to OLDA Letter

P. Law then presented a draft response to a letter to SCAG from the Orange Line Development Authority (OLDA) that was dated February 10, 2011. In response to a request from OLDA to expand the project area north to Santa Clarita, he stated that the AA study area is limited to the corridor between Downtown Los Angeles and Santa Ana. While a member stated that it would be inappropriate to expand the scope of the study area at this phase, another committee member suggested that the project area map should show how the PE ROW Alternatives could connect with high speed rail connections that are planned to connect north with the City of Santa Clarita in order to provide an overview of all systems and potential connections that are being planned. Other members advised that, although studying how to connect to Santa Clarita is beyond the scope of this study, it would be helpful for the public to see that there is a "vision" of future possibilities for connecting areas throughout the state. P. Law agreed that a map would be developed to show potential connections from Union Station to Santa Clarita. He further stated that the OLDA letter would be revised to reflect that change. The Steering Committee then approved the letter as amended.

## 3. Initial Screening Criteria

N. Michali then discussed the Initial Screening Criteria, which included:

- Public/Stakeholder Support
- Mobility Improvements
- Support for Development/Revitalization Plans
- Environmental Impacts
- Engineering and Operating Viability
- Cost/Conceptual Cost Per Rider

She presented the research and data on which the Criteria are based including Community Stakeholder Goals and Criteria; the Project's Purpose and Need; and the Mobility Problem. She reminded Committee Members that the Mobility Problem is the "problem statement" that the AA Study seeks to solve. For the Pacific Electric Right of Way/West Santa Ana Branch Corridor AA, N. Michali summarized the Mobility Problem in terms of transit system constraints, existing and future freeway and arterial congestion, and limited travel options.

#### **4. Initial Screening Phase**

N. Michali then reviewed the Initial Set of Alternatives and described how each alternative performed when "screened" with the criteria. The Initial Set of Alternatives was the following:

- No Build
- Transportation Systems Management (TSM)
- Bus Rapid Transit (BRT)
- Street Car
- Light Rail Transit (LRT)
- Multiple Unit/Sprinter
- Conventional High Speed Rail
- Maglev High Speed Service

#### **5. Final Set of Alternatives**

For review and discussion, N. Michali then presented the proposed Final Set of Alternatives, which would undergo in-depth analysis through the final phase of the Alternatives Analysis Study. She explained that they reflect the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) recommendations.

The proposed Final Set of Alternatives included:

- No Build
- TSM, including bicycle and pedestrian paths
- Bus Rapid Transit (BRT)
- Street Car
- Light Rail Transit (LRT)
- Low Speed Maglev

#### **Comments and Questions**

- T. Seymore stated that the City of Cypress wants only bike and pedestrian trails on the PE right-of-way, or else nothing. He further stated that Light Rail Transit should be built on, or adjacent to, the freeway system.
- C. Cavecche stated that OCTA has no interest in Low-Speed Maglev. Other committee members stated that there was "not much support" for Maglev and that extra money should not be allocated for studying a system that would not be accepted.
- H. Ikhrata stated that it was not originally SCAG's recommendation that the alternative of Low Speed Maglev be included; it was the Technical Advisory Committee's recommendation. He stated that SCAG accepted the recommendation, and was now proposing the Low Speed Maglev Alternative be included in the Final Set of Alternatives for further study.

- R. Rodriguez asked whether there could be different recommended strategies (alternatives) for north and south (Los Angeles County and Orange County) because each county had different ideas of what constitutes acceptable alternatives. P. Law stated that there may be different locally preferred strategies for each county identified at the conclusion of the Study.
- B. Barrows stated that it was a good idea to include Low Speed Maglev because the financial aspects of it are unknown, such as the operational costs of the system. Through the Study, however, much more information could be revealed.
- R. Rodriguez asked whether Low Speed Maglev had been included in the previous screening phase of the Study. P. Law stated that Low Speed Maglev had not been identified previously as an alternative, however, this is an appropriate point to add it as several Steering Committee members would like to see it included in the AA Study.

After discussion, the Steering Committee passed a motion with a majority of the members in support of recommending the following Final Set of Alternatives for further study:

- No Build
- TSM, with pedestrian paths and bike trails adjacent to the transit alternatives
- Bus Rapid Transit (BRT)
- Street Car
- Light Rail Transit (LRT)
- Low Speed Maglev

## **Next Steps**

D. DuBois stated that there should be “closure with the public, to let people know” about the Final Set of Alternatives. She suggested that community meetings be held during Summer 2011 to update the public. P. Law replied that SCAG would find additional resources in order to hold two additional community meetings: one in Los Angeles County and one in Orange County.